UNITED
NATIONS

CCPR

International covenant on civil and political rights

Distr.
GENERAL

CCPR/C/SR.1614
19 November 1997

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Sixtieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1614th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 31 July 1997, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Ms. CHANET

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (continued)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY THROUGH THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL UNDER ARTICLE 45 OF THE COVENANT AND ARTICLE 6 OF THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.97-17624 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 2) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to two documents, distributed in the languages in which they had been received, representing replies to the concluding observations on the consideration of the reports of Colombia and Georgia (fifty-ninth session). Members should have a look at them and decide how the Committee should take note of them in its annual report. On another matter she had met with the Ambassador of Nigeria about implementing the recommendations the Committee had made after considering that country's report. The Ambassador had clarified the timetable for the legislative and presidential elections to be held in 1998. He had assured her that the elections would take place in compliance with the Constitution, whose implementation had been suspended, and explained that the Constitution would again come fully into effect on 1 October 1998, when the newly-elected President would be in office. Five political movements would take part in the elections. The Ambassador had confirmed that it was now possible to appeal against decisions of the military courts, but had given a vague reply concerning habeas corpus. He had assured her that he would provide the Committee with a number of written reports before the sixty-first session and had taken note of all the points on which the Committee was still awaiting an explanation.

2. She invited the Committee to suggest issues which it would like her to raise at the eighth meeting of persons chairing the human rights treaty bodies, to be held in September.

3. Mr. KLEIN recalled that, at the most recent session of the Commission on Human Rights, the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance had been criticized and even censured. That incident was not without importance for a body such as the Committee, which occasionally made use of special rapporteurs' services, and it might be useful for the Chairman to raise that issue at the meeting of chairpersons.

4. The CHAIRMAN replied that it was difficult for the Committee as such to take a stand, but the question would be raised at the forthcoming session of the Sub-Commission, so that all committees would be informed of the issue, which would then be raised at the meeting of chairpersons.

5. Mr. BUERGENTHAL suggested that the chairpersons should be asked to think about the possibility of establishing working groups for the various committees, to be responsible for specific themes; there might, for example, be a working group on discrimination against women, in which members of all the committees would take part. Such an approach would have the advantage of ensuring coordination in accordance with procedures to be decided on by the committees themselves, which would avoid a coordination model being imposed on them from the outside.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that she particularly favoured a system of subcommittees since that approach would also avoid other coordination procedures which might be imposed from the outside. She would prepare a text containing concrete and specific proposals for that purpose.

7. Mr. LALLAH said he had no doubt that the meeting of chairpersons was the appropriate forum for discussing general policy questions relating to the independence of special procedures and functions. He nevertheless drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the special rapporteurs of the Commission on Human Rights had met and written to the Chairman of the Commission; the Chairman had held a meeting with the special rapporteurs, giving them the opportunity to inform him of their views and feelings, which would be duly transmitted to the Commission. At the current stage, therefore, it would be preferable for the Committee not to get involved in the incident, which could nevertheless be raised at the meeting of chairpersons in connection with the functioning of the special procedures established by the various committees.

8. As far as coordination of activities was concerned, a way must be found to enable the Committee to be informed of decisions taken by other committees in specific cases, especially committees which considered petitions. For example, the Committee against Torture considered communications, but not once during discussions of communications in the Human Rights Committee had the slightest reference been made to cases which had been considered by the Committee against Torture. It would be helpful for positions on related issues to be harmonized, and the chairpersons might perhaps develop a procedure for doing so. The Committee might wish to think about that question.

9. Ms. EVATT endorsed the proposals made so far and said that she wished to add a further suggestion. Some committees had plans of action for deciding on additional activities, to be financed by States or other bodies. The Chairman might ask about the status of such plans so as to enable the Committee to see whether it could find some ideas for increasing its resources.

10. Mr. SCHEININ observed that the International Law Commission had adopted a resolution on reservations to multilateral treaties, including human rights treaties. It would be useful for the Committee to have an opportunity to study the resolution at its sixty-first session, in the context of its own general comment 24 on the question of reservations. Thus the issue would be dealt with not at the forthcoming meeting of chairpersons but once the Committee had had an opportunity to reflect on the resolution.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that she had taken note of all the suggestions and would bear them in mind.

Submission and consideration of periodic reports

12. Mr. TISTOUNET (Centre for Human Rights) drew the attention of the members of the Committee to a note (CCPR/C/60/Sub.1) containing a list of reports received by the Committee, to which should be added the fourth periodic report of Japan, the fourth periodic report of Mexico, additional information from Belarus, the initial report of Armenia and the special report

of the United Kingdom on Hong Kong, describing the situation at 30 June 1997. The Committee would note that the number of reports received was steadily increasing.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that the reports of Belarus, Iraq, Jamaica, Lithuania, Senegal and the Sudan would be considered at the October 1997 session, and the reports of the following States at the sixty-second session in March 1998: Congo (subject to further developments), Cyprus, Ecuador, Finland, Tanzania, Uruguay and Zimbabwe. The Bureau had opted not to hold periodic reports in reserve, preferring to run the risk of having to consider all the reports rather than not having enough, as had occurred at the current session. It still needed to decide the composition of the Working Group on article 40. Ten members had volunteered for the New York session, but there had been only three volunteers for the October session: Ms. Evatt, Mr. Bhagwati and Lord Colville.

14. Mr. KLEIN said the experience of the sixtieth session showed that the lists of issues were too long; in the future the Committee should keep to a smaller number of particularly important aspects and try to focus on them. The question should be discussed by the plenary Committee.

15. The CHAIRMAN endorsed the idea of changing the system of drawing up the lists, but said that it should be discussed as part of a general debate on what the Committee expected from the reports. It would be difficult to change the rules for the sixty-first session as they had been adopted fairly recently. Some thought should be given to the question.

16. Mr. BHAGWATI said that the best way for the Committee to reduce the number of questions on the lists of issues was to take the concluding observations concerning the previous report as a basis and limit itself to the problems that had been highlighted. In order to rationalize the actual consideration of periodic reports during sessions, the Committee might send the list to the State party concerned as soon as it was compiled, and ask the State to send back its written replies before the session. Even if the replies were received only a few days before consideration of the report, that would greatly facilitate the Committee's task. In addition, the members responsible for drafting the lists should be given the reports on which they would be working one session in advance. Thus the members who would be drawing up the lists of issues for the March 1998 session should be appointed at the present session, so that they could be given the reports at the sixty-first session, in October 1997, and have more time to work on them.

17. Mr. POCAR said that he was not against the idea of asking States parties for written replies, but wished to stress the technical difficulties involved in such a system: if the replies were not considered to be an official document they would be distributed in the original language only; if they were considered an official document, they would have to be translated, which would also cause problems. Moreover, the system of consideration of reports was intended to encourage a dialogue with the State party's delegation, for which the use of written replies was not very appropriate.

18. Regarding the reports to be considered at the following session, he endorsed the Bureau's decision to schedule a large number of reports in order to be sure that a minimum would be considered, but he wondered whether the Committee was not witnessing an unfortunate trend: States parties raised implausible or trivial pretexts in order to avoid having to appear before the Committee on the scheduled date. The rule was that, only unexpected and serious events, and no other reason, could prevent a State party from coming before the Committee. It might be advisable for the notes verbales which the Committee sent to States parties reminding them of the date mutually agreed on with their permanent mission to state systematically that the date was mandatory. In any event, the Committee should look into that question, which was causing increasing concern.

19. Ms. EVATT said it was regrettable that the members of the Working Group on article 40 were not given the reports on which they would be working a long time in advance. They should receive the reports at least one session in advance and should consider the possibility of also drafting the lists of issues one session in advance.

20. Mr. TISTOUNET (Secretary of the Committee) explained that the difficulties which the secretariat encountered in distributing State party reports to the members of the Committee were partly due to printing and translation problems. The secretariat always did its best to provide members with reports in time for the session; thus, before the end of the current session, it would be providing them with the reports of Belarus, Senegal and the Sudan, which were to be considered at the October session.

21. There were 30 names on the list of State party reports received by the secretariat, but that did not mean that those reports were ready for distribution, as they had to be edited and translated. It should also be borne in mind that the editing and translation sections were inundated with reports from States that were parties not only to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights but also to the other international human rights instruments. Those reports also had to be edited and translated. Consequently, the secretariat selected certain reports for priority treatment and, and after each session, it sent the Documents Control Section a list of those which were to be translated and reproduced as a matter of urgency. It should be borne in mind, however, that documents for sessions such as those of the Commission on Human Rights in March and April and the Sub-Commission in August had priority over the reports requested for the Committee. For the October session, therefore, members would very soon be receiving the reports of Belarus, Senegal and the Sudan. The secretariat would contact Documents Control to see that the reports of Iraq, Jamaica and Lithuania were reproduced as priority documents and sent immediately to members.

22. Replying to Mr. Bhagwati, he explained that the secretariat always transmitted to the members of the Committee information that could help them draw up the list of issues, such as the Committee's concluding observations and even occasionally observations adopted by other treaty bodies, except in cases when the previous report had been considered too long before. Before the current session, members of the Committee had been sent by fax a background paper prepared by the secretariat to help them draw up the list of

issues to be taken up in connection with the consideration of the report of a State party which it was known would not be available before the session or before the Working Group's meeting.

23. Mr. BUERGENTHAL said that although some problems were beyond the Committee's control, there were others for which the members could try to find a solution. Mr. Klein, Mr. Bhagwati and other members had made a number of recommendations. For his part, he suggested that the Chairman should establish a small working group to gather ideas and proposals from members of the Committee on an informal basis, by telephone, e-mail or fax, and submit to the Committee at its October session a paper with proposals for changes in procedure. The Committee should set aside one or two days for a thorough discussion of the matter, in order to resolve it before the situation grew worse.

24. Ms. MEDINA QUIROGA said that there was no need to wait for State party reports to be translated before distributing them to members of the Committee. For example, she could receive reports submitted in Spanish and study them in the original language, which would save time; she had in mind the reports of Uruguay and Ecuador, which were due to be considered at the spring 1998 session.

25. Ms. GAITAN DE POMBO endorsed Mr. Buergenthal's proposal.

26. Mr. LALLAH said that he wondered whether it was really necessary to draft a written list of issues for the consideration of initial reports. For the consideration of subsequent periodic reports, the lists often contained too many questions; the Committee should perhaps keep to the background paper prepared by the secretariat, together with the concluding observations concerning the previous report. That would leave more time for dialogue with States parties when their reports were considered.

27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed as suggested by Mr. Buergenthal.

28. It was so decided.

Draft concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee concerning the third periodic reports of France and India and the initial report of Slovakia (continued)

29. The CHAIRMAN noted that two points needed to be settled in order to complete the final version of each of the three texts of the concluding observations concerning the reports of France, India and Slovakia. First, the Committee must set the date by which each of the three States parties was to submit its next periodic report.

30. After an exchange of views in which Mr. LALLAH, Ms. EVATT, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. BHAGWATI and Mr. POCAR took part, the following dates were proposed: 2000 for the fourth periodic report of France and 2001 for the fourth report of India and the second report of Slovakia.

31. It was so decided.

32. Lord COLVILLE said that, for the paragraph to be placed at the end of the concluding observations concerning each of the three periodic reports in question, he had prepared a text which seemed to meet with the approval of members.

33. The CHAIRMAN read out the text proposed by Lord Colville: "The Committee draws to the attention of the Government of (name of State party) the provisions of paragraph 6 (a) of its guidelines regarding the form and contents of periodic reports from State parties and requests that, accordingly, its next periodic report should contain material which responds to all these concluding observations. The Committee further requests that these be widely disseminated among the public at large in all parts of ... ."

34. The text proposed by Lord Colville was adopted.

Recommendations of the Bureau: special decisions

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the initial reports of a number of States parties were long overdue. The Bureau proposed that the Committee should take special decisions requesting two of them, Cambodia and Israel, to submit their initial report for consideration at the Committee's next session.

36. The two draft decisions were contained in a document without a symbol, distributed in English only, which read:

"Israel

The Human Rights Committee,

- Deeply concerned by allegations of violations of human rights,

- Noting that the initial report of Israel was due for submission to the Committee on 2 January 1993,

- Acting under article 40, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

1. Requests the Government of Israel to submit its initial report without delay for discussion by the Committee at its sixty-first session in October/November 1997 and, in any event, to submit by 15 September 1997 a report, in summary form if necessary, relating in particular to the application at the present time of articles 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 26 and 27 of the Covenant;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to bring this decision to the attention of the Government of Israel."

"Cambodia

The Human Rights Committee,

- Deeply concerned by allegations of violations of human rights,

- Noting that the initial report of Cambodia was due for submission to the Committee on 25 August 1993,

- Acting under article 40, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

1. Requests the Government of Cambodia to submit its initial report without delay for discussion by the Committee at its sixty-first session in October/November 1997 and, in any event, to submit by 15 September 1997 a report, in summary form if necessary, relating in particular to the application at the present time of articles 6, 7, 9, 12, 25, 26 and 27 of the Covenant;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to bring this decision to the attention of the Government of Cambodia."

37. Mr. LALLAH noted that in paragraph 1 the Committee requested the Governments of the States parties to submit their initial reports for consideration at its sixty-first session in October/November 1997, or, if they could not, to submit a summary report on certain articles of the Covenant. In his view, that amounted to asking for a report in summary form at the outset. He proposed that the Committee should send both countries a note requesting them to submit their initial reports for the October 1997 session. If they had not done so by October, then and then only would they be asked to submit a special report.

38. Mr. POCAR said that he agreed with Mr. Lallah, but believed that the Committee should take a special decision and also send the States parties a note. He further proposed that the first preambular paragraph should be amended to say that the Committee was deeply concerned by allegations of violations of human rights protected under the Covenant.

39. Mr. BUERGENTHAL said that he had no objection to the Committee requesting both States parties to submit their initial report, on the ground that the initial report of no other State party was so long overdue. On the other hand, he was by no means prepared to endorse a decision stating that the Committee was deeply concerned by allegations of violations of human rights without specifying the source of those allegations and without any information to help him make his decision.

40. Mr. ANDO recalled that in the past States parties had generally given effect to the Committee's special decisions. He shared the views of Mr. Lallah and Mr. Pocar.

41. Mr. KLEIN considered that the Committee should ask for the usual full report on the implementation of the entire Covenant, in other words, an

initial report. He proposed deleting the first preambular paragraph, as Mr. Buergenthal had suggested, and retaining only the beginning of operative paragraph 1, which would end with the words "in October/November 1997".

42. Mr. BUERGENTHAL asked whether any other States parties were in the same situation as Cambodia and Israel.

43. The CHAIRMAN said it was true that other States parties were behind in submitting their initial reports, but some countries gave greater cause for concern, especially in the light of the deliberations of the Committee against Torture and the statement to the Committee by Mr. Zacklin, representative of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

44. Mr. POCAR said that he appreciated Mr. Buergenthal's position. All countries should be treated equally as far as the submission of their initial reports was concerned. There were countries whose reports were even more overdue than the States parties referred to in the two draft special decisions. The Committee's action was only justified if there were special reasons to take such a decision, in which case the matter should be discussed.

45. Lord COLVILLE noted that in addition to Israel and Cambodia, the initial reports of 24 States parties were listed as being overdue and there was no doubt that the human rights situation in many of those States left much to be desired. He wondered why the Committee should single out Israel and Cambodia for a special request.

46. Mr. YALDEN said that he shared Lord Colville's concern.

47. Mr. ANDO proposed that, to be fair, the request which the Committee was considering sending to Israel and Cambodia should also be sent to all the States parties whose initial report was more than four years overdue.

48. Mr. KLEIN endorsed Mr. Ando's proposal, but noted that if it was adopted, the States parties in question could not reasonably be asked to submit their initial reports before the Committee's sixty-first session in October/November 1997.

49. The CHAIRMAN noted that the rules for submission of reports by States parties contained a requirement that the Government should actually be in a position to prepare a report. In the cases at hand, there were doubts as to the ability of the Governments of Grenada, the former Yugoslavia, Croatia, Somalia and Equatorial Guinea to prepare reports for the Committee.

50. Mr. LALLAH noted that when States parties ratified the Covenant they undertook to produce an initial report one year after its entry into force; in his view, that was an obligation which no State party should evade, unless of course war broke out, which had been the case in Lebanon, for example.

51. Mr. ANDO said that he shared Mr. Lallah's view. The criteria established should apply equally to all States parties that had ratified the Covenant.

52. Ms. GAITAN DE POMBO agreed that every State party had a duty to submit at least an initial report to the Committee, and she also tended to agree that a special request should be addressed not only to Israel and Cambodia, but to all States parties whose initial report was more than four years overdue.

53. Mr. POCAR recalled that the Committee had considered a special report by Croatia on certain of the articles of the Covenant in October 1992. The Committee might therefore show a bit more flexibility towards Croatia and allow it a further year to submit its initial report.

54. The CHAIRMAN announced that, at its sixty-first session, in October/November 1997, the Committee should consider the initial reports of Cambodia, Israel and Grenada and, at its sixty-second session in March 1998, the initial reports of Albania, Angola, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire and the Seychelles, and that the text of the Committee's special decision, adapted to each one, would be sent to all eight States parties.

55. Mr. LALLAH pointed out that the Committee would have to decide without delay where to place Hong Kong (Special administrative region) on the list of States parties whose reports were due, since the territory was no longer a dependency of the United Kingdom.

The meeting was suspended at 4.50 p.m. and resumed at 5.10 p.m.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY THROUGH THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL UNDER ARTICLE 45 OF THE COVENANT AND ARTICLE 6 OF THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL (agenda item 9) (CCPR/C/60/CRP.1 and Corr.1, CCPR/C/60/CRP.1/Add.1, 3 and 4, CCPR/C/60/CRP.2 and Add.1 and 3)

56. Ms. EVATT (Rapporteur) introduced the draft annual report of the Committee contained in the above-mentioned documents; it was understood that the secretariat would make the necessary drafting changes and change the paragraph numbering in accordance with the decisions taken by the Committee.

57. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft annual report.

CCPR/C/60/CRP.1 and Corr.1

Chapter I (Organizational and other matters)

Paragraphs 1 to 24

58. Paragraphs 1 to 24 were adopted.

Paragraph 25

59. Ms. EVATT (Rapporteur) suggested that the paragraph should be expanded slightly to reflect the following situation: although it had been possible in recent years to maintain a rate of publication of four volumes of Official Documents of the Human Rights Committee per year, the problem of resources would arise again next year in connection with publication of the Yearbook and summary records, unless measures were taken.

60. Mr. POCAR considered the problem to be a serious one. Thanks to a donation from the Sasakawa Foundation, it had been possible to reduce the backlog to some extent but there was still the question of the failure to prepare summary records for the October 1993 session, which prevented the publication of work after that date. In those circumstances, the Committee might incorporate the contents of paragraphs 50 and 51 in paragraph 25.

61. Mr. ANDO read out the contents of paragraph 51 and noted that a break in publication of the Yearbook deprived people outside the Committee of the possibility of studying its work. The Sasakawa Foundation donation had made it possible to reduce the backlog, but that was not sufficient. He would like to know whether the competent United Nations services might be able to resolve the problem through internal resources or whether there were plans to appeal for outside contributions.

62. Ms. KLEIN (Centre for Human Rights) said that, of the $250,000 donated by the Sasakawa Foundation, only $20,000 or so was still available, which would not be sufficient to solve the problem. A number of other Centre for Human Rights publications were also overdue, and so it was unlikely that publication of the Yearbook would be given priority.

63. Ms. EVATT (Rapporteur) suggested that, in view of the remarks of Mr. Pocar and Mr. Ando, the text of paragraph 25 should be amended in the following way. The first sentence would stand as it was. The second sentence would be replaced by one in which the Committee would say that it was concerned at the fact that it no longer appeared possible further to reduce the backlog by means of the Sasakawa Foundation donation alone. The Committee would appeal for new resources, whether from the United Nations or from outside, and express the hope that publishing could thus resume, and in particular the preparation of the summary records of the 1993 session, which should be given appropriate priority. The contents of paragraph 51 would then be reproduced and the responsibility of the Centre for Human Rights in that respect emphasized. Those changes would make paragraph 26 unnecessary and it could therefore be deleted.

64. Paragraph 25, as orally amended by Ms. Evatt, was adopted.

Paragraph 26

65. Paragraph 26 was deleted.

Paragraph 27

66. Paragraph 27 was adopted.

Paragraph 27 (b) (CCPR/C/60/CRP.1/Corr.1)

67. Ms. EVATT (Rapporteur) said that paragraph 27 (b) should be placed immediately after paragraph 27.

68. Paragraph 27 (b) was adopted.

Paragraph 28

69. Mr. POCAR suggested that in the last sentence the words "one of" should be deleted and the words "at Geneva and" should be added before the words "in New York".

70. Paragraph 28, as amended in accordance with to Mr. Pocar's proposal and in conformity with document CCPR/C/60/CRP.1/Corr.1, was adopted.

Paragraph 29 (CCPR/C/60/CRP.1/Corr.1)

71. Paragraph 29, as proposed in document CCPR/C/60/CRP.1/Corr.1, was deleted.

Paragraph 30

72. Paragraph 30 was adopted, subject to the addition of the corresponding numbers of the Committee's meetings.

Chapter II (Methods of work of the Committee under article 40 of the Covenant: overview of present working methods)

73. Ms. EVATT (Rapporteur), introducing the chapter on the Committee's working methods, referred to the contents of paragraph 32 and noted that paragraphs 33 et seq. reflected the decision adopted by the Committee at its fifty-eighth session regarding the final report on the informal meeting held on 27-28 July 1996. The chapter on working methods in the current report therefore departed from previous practice in that it included points taken from that final report. She reminded the Committee that it had decided, at its fifty-eighth session, to publish the final report on the July 1996 meeting in its annual report and invited members to express their views on how they wished to proceed in that regard (whether to publish the report as an annex to the annual report or as part of it). Paragraphs 31 and 32, however, could be adopted at once. As she understood it, members wished in any event to delete the sentence in square brackets in paragraph 34. The Committee's decision might make it necessary to slightly reformulate paragraph 32 in order to ensure the overall consistency of chapter II.

Paragraph 31

74. Paragraph 31 was adopted.

A. Informal Meeting on Procedures

75. Mr. SCHEININ suggested that the words "and later developments" should be added at the end of the title of subsection A.

76. Mr. Scheinin's proposal was adopted.

Paragraph 32

77. Paragraph 32 was adopted subject to correction of the date of the 27-28 July 1996 meeting.

Paragraphs 33-41

78. Mr. ANDO suggested that paragraph 36 should indicate how the various country rapporteurs were chosen.

79. Mr. POCAR considered that selection of the rapporteurs was a purely internal Committee matter and should not appear in the annual report.

80. Mr. LALLAH said that he fully shared Mr. Pocar's view. In his opinion, all of paragraph 36 should be deleted.

81. Lord COLVILLE observed that paragraph 36 might be recast and shortened to say simply that the Committee had explored ways of improving consideration of State party reports and the gathering of the necessary information. He agreed that it should not go into the question of country rapporteurs, which was an internal procedure of the Committee.

82. Mr. YALDEN and Mr. TÜRK, reverting to the question of principle raised by Ms. Evatt, said that the paragraphs on working methods for the consideration of State reports should appear as an annex to the annual report.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that it appeared difficult, for reasons of confidentiality, to put the paragraphs on the July 1996 meeting in an annex. However, if the paragraphs were included in the body of the annual report, the Committee should be careful not to give any indication of its internal procedures, which States parties did not need to know and which in any case had not been determined on a permanent basis.

84. Mr. LALLAH suggested a new paragraph, to be inserted immediately after paragraph 32, in which the Committee would state that, at an informal meeting held on 27-28 July 1996, it had considered various matters, including working methods for the consideration of State reports and overdue reports, and simply list the various headings of subsection A. Like the Chairman, he drew attention to the fact that the Committee's procedures were constantly evolving, and that fact should be duly reflected in the annual report.

85. Mr. KLEIN considered that paragraphs 35-41 should be deleted.

86. Mr. BUERGENTHAL said that, as far as he recollected, the final report on the 27-28 July 1996 meeting had been considered and adopted at the fifty-eighth session at a public meeting. It must therefore have been published as a document for general distribution and so could be reproduced in an annex to the current annual report.

87. The CHAIRMAN noted that the meeting at which the Committee had adopted the report had indeed been a public meeting, but the contents of the report had not been made public, as the Committee had decided to publish it in its annual report.

88. The Committee would continue its consideration of paragraphs 33-41 of document CCPR/C/60/CRP.1 at its next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.